arXiv:cond-mat/9504059v1 13 Apr 1995

Complexity as the driving force for dynamical glassy transitions

Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen
Van der Waals-Zeeman Laboratorium, Universiteit van Amsterdam
Valckenierstraat 65, 1018 XE Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(March 20, 1995; email: nieuwenh@phys.uva.nl)

Aspects of the dynamical glass transition are considered within a mean field spin glass model. At the dynamical transition the the system condenses in a state of lower entropy. The difference, the information entropy or complexity, is calculated by analysis of the metastable (TAP) states. It increases for lower temperatures, showing that more and more free energy barriers cannot be overcome on accessible times scales. Near T_c the total glassy free energy lies below the paramagnetic one, which makes the transition unavoidable from a thermodynamic point of view. The multitude of glassy states implies an extensive difference between the average specific heat and the derivative of the average internal energy.

64.70.Pf, 75.10Nr,75.40Cx,75.50Lk

The structural glass transition is said to occur at the temperature T_g where the viscosity equals 10^{14} Poise. The precise nature of this transition is not fully understood. Experimentally one often determines the entropy from the specific heat data by integrating C/T from a reference temperature in the liquid phase down to T. At zero temperature a residual entropy is found, in contradiction with the third law of thermodynamics.

Alternatively, a glass can be seen as a disordered solid. In this description the glass transition is a transition to a state with much smaller entropy than the liquid. As the free energy then becomes larger, it is not immediately clear from thermodynamic considerations why the system gets captured in such a state. The answer is that the condensed system then has lost the entropy of selecting one out of the many equivalent states; this part of the entropy is called the *information entropy* or *complexity* $\mathcal{I}$. [1] [2] Its origin can be understood as follows. When the relevant state a has a large degeneracy $\mathcal{N}_a \equiv \exp(\mathcal{I}_a)$, the partition sum yields $Z = \sum_b \exp(-\beta F_b) \approx \mathcal{N}_a \exp(-\beta F_a)$, so $F = F_a - T\mathcal{I}_a$ is the full free energy of the system. The entropy loss arises when the system chooses the state to condense into, since from then on only that single state is observed. [3] As the total entropy $S = S_a + \mathcal{I}_a$ is continuous, so is the total free energy. If the weights p_a of the states a are fixed at the transition, [1] one can assume that the free energy difference between the condensed phase and the liquid is positive and grows quadratically below T_c. This explains the well known discontinuity in quantities such as the specific heat. However, it is a bit unsatisfactory that this higher free energy branch describes the physical state.

Recent work on glasses mainly has been performed from a dynamic approach. Mode coupling equations starting from the liquid phase have been studied for some while. [4] At a critical temperature $T_c > T_g$ a dynamic phase transition has been reported. The presence of this transition has been questioned, however. [5]

We wish to analyze these and related questions within a relatively well understood spin glass model, the mean field p-spin interaction spin glass, defined by the Hamiltonian (1). Kirkpatrick and Thirumalai [6] pointed out that for the case $p = 3$ there is a close analogy with models for the structural glass transition. Moreover, its properties are quite insensitive of the value of p as long as $p > 2$. The spherical limit of this model has received some attention recently. Its static version was solved by Crisanti and Sommers. [7] They find a static first order transition to a state with one step replica symmetry breaking (1RSB) at a temperature T_g. The dynamics of this system was studied by Crisanti, Horner and Sommers (CHS) [8] and Cugliandolo and Kurchan [9]. Both groups find a dynamical transition at a temperature $T_c > T_g$, which can be interpreted on a quasi-static level as a 1RSB transition. For $T < T_c$ one of the fluctuation modes is massless ("marginal"), not unexpected for a glassy state. At T_c^- there is a drop in the specific heat. Integrating C/T to define the "dynamical" entropy yields a free energy that exceeds the paramagnetic one quadratically. Ref. [10] discusses the interpretation of metastable states ("TAP-states") in this system. The statistics of those states was considered by Crisanti and Sommers (CS). [11] They reproduced the dynamical free energy obtained in [8]. As a side remark, let us draw attention to the model with both random pair couplings and random quartet couplings. It is an exactly solvable spin glass model with infinite order replica symmetry breaking, [12] which remains exactly solvable after quantization of the spherical spins. [13]

The present author recently proposed a replica calculation as a short cut for the long time result of the dynamical analysis. [14] He took the principle point of view that a dynamical transition will automatically get trapped in a state with diverging time scale, if present. In a replica analysis this led him to replace Parisi's stationarity criterion for the location of the breakpoint of the 1RSB solution by a marginality criterion. In this way the correct dynamical transition temperature and shape of the order parameter function were reproduced from replica's for a number of model systems. However, as the free energy is minimized in this procedure, it was found to lie near T_c *below* the paramagnetic value and to have a larger slope.

Though this is exactly what one expects at a first order phase transition, such a replica result cannot be trusted without independent verification and interpretation.

For a system with N spins we consider the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = -\sum_{i_1<i_2<\cdots<i_p} J_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_p} S_{i_1} S_{i_2}\cdots S_{i_p} - H\sum_i S_i \quad (1)$$

with independent Gaussian random couplings, that have average zero and variance $J^2 p!/2N^{p-1}$. The spins are subject to the spherical condition $\sum_i S_i^2 = N$. At zero field the replica calculation gives the free energy [7]

$$\frac{F}{N} = -\frac{\beta J^2}{4} + \frac{\beta J^2}{4}\xi q^p - \frac{T}{2x}\log(1-\xi q) + \frac{T\xi}{2x}\log(1-q) \quad (2)$$

where $\xi = 1-x$. The first term describes the paramagnetic free energy. Here and in the sequel, we omit the $T=\infty$ entropy. It is a constant, only fixed after quantizing the spherical model, [13] that plays no role in the present discussion. For the marginal solution q is fixed by equating the lowest fluctuation eigenvalue to zero, which gives $p(p-1)\beta^2 J^2 q^{p-2}(1-q)^2/2 = 1$. The condition $\partial F/\partial q = 0$ then yields $x = x(q) \equiv (p-2)(1-q)/q$. This dynamical transition sets in at temperature $T_c = J\{p(p-2)^{p-2}/2(p-1)^{p-1}\}^{1/2}$ where x comes below unity.

The metastable states of this system, labeled by $a = 1, 2, \cdots, \mathcal{N}$, have local magnetizations $m_i^a = \langle S_i\rangle^a$. At $H = 0$ their free energy $F_a = F_{TAP}(m_i^a)$ is a minimum of the "TAP" free energy [10]

$$F_{\,TAP}(m_i) = -\sum_{i_1<i_2<\ldots<i_p} J_{i_1 i_2\cdots<i_p} m_{i_1} m_{i_2}\cdots m_{i_p} - \frac{NT}{2}\log(1-q) - \frac{N\beta J^2}{4}(1+(p-1)q^p - pq^{p-1}) \quad (3)$$

where now $q = (1/N)\sum_i m_i^2$ is the self-overlap. Palmer [2] calls the metastable states "components". According to the Gibbs weight their probability of occurrence is $p_a = \exp(-\beta F_a(T))/Z$, with $Z = \sum_a \exp(-\beta F_a)$. Given the p_a's one can calculate the "component averages" such as $\overline{F} = \sum_a p_a F_a$ and $\overline{S} = \sum_a p_a S_a$. For a given sample they are the objects one finds when repeating the measurement very often, and averaging over the outcomes.

The nice thing of the present model is that many questions can be answered directly. After setting $\partial F_{TAP}/\partial m_i = 0$, we can use this equation to express F_a in terms of q_a alone. This gives $F_a = Nf(q_a)$ where

$$f(q) = \frac{\beta J^2}{4}[-1+(p-1)q^p - (p-2)q^{p-1}] - \frac{Tq}{p(1-q)} - \frac{T}{2}\log(1-q) \quad (4)$$

Since F_a only depends on the selfoverlap q_a, it is self-averaging. In the paramagnet one has $m_i = q = 0$, so both eqs. (3) and (4) reproduce the replica free energy $F/N = -\beta J^2/4$. From the replica analysis we know that at T_c^- the value of q is $q_c = (p-2)/(p-1)$. The component free energy $F_a = Nf(q_c)$ exceeds the free energy $-\beta J^2 N/4$ of the paramagnet. As expected from experimental knowledge on glasses, the internal energy is continuous. The difference is solely due to the lower entropy, $S_a = -N\beta^2 J^2/4 - \mathcal{I}_c$, where

$$\mathcal{I}_c = N\left(\frac{1}{2}\log(p-1) + \frac{2}{p} - 1\right) \quad (5)$$

is the value of complexity at the transition point.

This discussion shows explicitly that the entropy of the component the system condenses in, as well as its average $\overline{S}$, is much smaller that the entropy of the paramagnet. In the quantized system $\overline{S}$ will vanish at $T = 0$. [12]

A simple calculation shows that the dynamical free energy of CHS and CS, and the marginal replica free energy obtained from eq. (2) [14] have the following connection with the component average free energy $\overline{F} = Nf(q)$:

$$F_{dyn} = \overline{F} - T\mathcal{I}_c \quad (6)$$

$$F = \overline{F} - \frac{T\mathcal{I}_c}{x(q)} \quad (7)$$

Since $x = 1$ at the transition, both are continuous there.

Due to the difference between (7) and (6) we have decided to redo the analysis of the TAP equations. Hereto we consider the generalized partition sum

$$Z_u = \sum_a e^{-u\beta F_a(T)} \quad (8)$$

For $u = 0$ we thus calculate the total number $\mathcal{N}$ of TAP-states, while for $u = 1$ we consider their partition sum. The sum over the TAP states can be calculated using standard approaches. [15] One goes to integrals over all m_i-values of $\exp(-u\beta F_{TAP}(m_i))$ $\prod_i \delta\left(\partial\beta F_{TAP}/\partial m_i\right)\det\left(\partial^2\beta F_{TAP}/\partial m_i\partial m_j\right)$ [16] and introduces conjugate fields for writing the delta functions and the determinant as exponential integrals. After averaging over disorder, bilinear overlaps of these field act as order parameters at a saddle point. They are introduced at the cost of conjugated order parameters, that we indicate by a hat. The replicated free energy reads

$$\frac{F_u^{(n)}}{N} = u\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} f(q_{\alpha\alpha}) - T\Phi_n \quad (9)$$

$$\Phi_n = \sum_{\alpha\beta}\left\{q_{\alpha\beta}\hat{q}_{\alpha\beta} + y_{\alpha\beta}\hat{y}_{\alpha\beta} + z_{\alpha\beta}\hat{z}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\lambda_{\alpha\beta}}{4}(y_{\alpha\beta}^2 - z_{\alpha\beta}^2)\right\} + \mathrm{tr}\ln(a-\hat{z}) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\ln\left[(a-\hat{y})^2 + \sigma\hat{q}\right] \quad (10)$$

Here $\lambda_{\alpha\beta} = \beta^2 J^2 p(p-1)q_{\alpha\beta}^{p-2}$, $a_{\alpha\beta} = a_\alpha\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ with $a_\alpha \equiv \lambda_{\alpha\alpha}(1-q_{\alpha\alpha})/2 + 1/(1-q_{\alpha\alpha})$ and $\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = p\beta^2 J^2(q_{\alpha\beta})^{p-1}$.

Usually one assumes that no replica symmetry breaking occurs when one calculates the number of TAP states. However, since in eq. (9) it does occur at $u = 1$, it is not a well motivated assumption that it would not occur for $u = 0$. Having in mind the 1RSB solution of the ordinary partition sum, we are therefore led to investigate a similar breaking scheme in the replicated TAP approach. We thus set $q_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \langle m_\alpha m_\beta \rangle = (q_0 - q_1)\delta_{\alpha\beta} + q_1 \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is Parisi's 1RSB matrix, having $\mathcal{E} = 1$ on all n/x diagonal blocks of size $x * x$, while zero elsewhere. A similar 1RSB pattern is assumed for the 5 other order parameters. At fixed x the 12-dimensional saddle point can be found explicitly; details will be given elsewhere. As expected, the above replica expression for q is found back as solution of $\partial f(q_0)/\partial q_0 = 0$ at $q_0 = q$. The result $q_1 = q_0$ asserts that the mutual overlap between different states in the same cluster is equal to the selfoverlap. As in the replica calculation of the ordinary partition sum, x can still take any value. For the long time limit of the dynamical approach the marginality condition should be taken, [14] in the form given below eq. (2). It turns out that the fluctuation matrix then automatically has 3 zero eigenvalues, proving the marginality. The lowest acceptable value of $F_u(T; x)$ is obtained when x takes the boundary value

$$x(q, u) = \frac{x(q)}{u} = (p - 2)\frac{1 - q}{uq} \tag{11}$$

where one more eigenvalue vanishes. At the marginal point one then finds $\Phi_n = n\mathcal{I}_c/Nx(q, u)$, which implies

$$F_u(T) = u\left[\overline{F}(T) - \frac{T\mathcal{I}_c}{ux(q, u)}\right] = uF(T) \tag{12}$$

For $u = 1$ we thus recover the replica result (7) rather than the dynamical expression (6). The latter expression is still correct in the sense of CHS, namely as the component average free energy with entropy shifted over the constant $\mathcal{I}_c$, so that it is continous at T_c. However, after quantization $\mathcal{I}_c$ then remains as residual entropy at $T = 0$. The derivation of eq. (6) by CS is based on two assumptions that are both subject to criticism.

From eq. (7) we observe that the complexity is temperature dependent: $\mathcal{I}(T) = \mathcal{I}_c/x(q(T))$. Its increase towards smaller T shows that more and more components become available for the system. In other words, when decreasing the temperature phase space splits up more and more. At each temperature there appear new free energy barriers which can no longer be overcome. This well known notion of mean field spin glass theory, which nicely explains temperature cycling aging experiments, [22] is unknown in glass theory. Note that $\mathcal{I}(T)$ diverges as $1/T$ at low T. This leads to an infinite complexity at $T = 0$ for time scales where the marginal state describes the physics. These will probably include the experimentally accessible time scales.

It would be nice to have a measurable quantity that probes the multitude of solutions. One object that should be accessible, at least numerically, is the specific heat. The standard expression $C = dU/dT = \sum_a d(p_a U_a)/dT$ is likely to differ from the component average $\overline{C} = \sum_a p_a dU_a/dT$. [2] The interesting question is whether their difference is extensive. Based on experience in a toy model, [18] we think it generally is. Since in the present model the energy fluctuations are too small at $H = 0$, [24] it can only occur in a field. From the CHS or replica internal energy U in a small field we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N}C(T, H) = \frac{1}{2}\beta^2 J^2(1 + (p - 1)q^p - pq^{p-1}) - \beta^2 H^2 \frac{(p - 1)^2(p - 2)(1 - q)^2}{p(pq + 2 - p)} \tag{13}$$

On the other hand, a short calculation shows that $C_a = T dS_a/dT$ remains only a function of q_a at the marginal point, which in the present model is field-independent. This implies that $\overline{C}$ is field-independent as well, thus satisfying the Parisi-Toulouse hypothesis [23]. Interestingly enough, we find $C < \overline{C}$, whereas Palmer derives the opposite. Our reversed "dynamical" inequality is a new result that is due to the marginality.

Some more aspects are of interest. Coming from the low temperature side, the transition has the nature of a continuous glassy transition. In a replica formulation states with breakpoint $x = x(q)$ have massive longitudinal fluctuations ($\Lambda' \sim T_c - T$) and massless transversal fluctuations. (The latter modes are commonly called the "replicon"; we have proposed the more physical name "ergodon" [12]). This structure is very reminiscent of the behavior of fluctuations in the SK model, be it much simpler. In an external field the degeneracy of the longitudinal eigenmode is lifted. It remains as a non-degenerate small eigenvalue which vanishes at the same point where the transversal "ergodon" becomes marginal. Therefore the same picture remains valid in an external field. In particular, there is a de Almeida-Thouless line where the paramagnet becomes unstable with respect to non-linear perturbations related to the 1RSB solution discussed.

It would be useful to study the loop expansion. This may shed light on the lower critical dimension of the problem and on the relation with structural glasses.

In finite (but large?) dimensions our explanation is incompatible with a droplet picture. [19] The assumption that the condensed phase is non-degenerate implies $\mathcal{I}_c/N = 0$. Then it remains unclear from a thermodynamic point of view why a transition to a state with higher free energy can occur. It is also not obvious whether a droplet approach can explain our reversed inequality $C < \overline{C}$.

In conclusion, we have considered a mean field model for a spin glass. As it undergoes a first order phase transition to a state with one step of replica symmetry breaking, it has many features of models for glassy transitions, possibly in the absence of disorder. Within this model we have found that the following scenario takes place:

- At T_c the system freezes in a metastable state with free energy much higher than that of the paramagnet.
- The component average entropy $\overline{S}$ drops at T_c by an extensive amount $\mathcal{I}_c$, related to the degeneracy of the glassy states at T_c.
- The entropy $S = \overline{S} + \mathcal{I}$, the internal energy, and the free energy are continuous.
- $\overline{S}$ vanishes at $T = 0$, so there is no residual entropy.
- Below T_c the glassy free energy lies below the paramagnetic one, and has a larger slope. Therefore the transition is first order and unavoidable in the thermodynamic sense. The driving force is the complexity.
- There is no latent heat, but a there is a drop in the heat capacity.
- In an adiabatic cooling experiment the weights of the states are initially set at T_c. However, there will be a further bifurcation of phase space at any lower T.
- The inequality $C/N < \overline{C}/N$ is a direct result of the multitude of states and their marginality.

Though having considered only one specific model, we are tempted to believe that the developed picture is very general. The role of disorder is probably not essential. What is needed is an extensive complexity. It seems to occur at many glassy and glass transitions. However, continuous transitions with infinite order replica symmetry breaking are known to behave differently.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks J. Kurchan, H. Rieger, R. Schmitz and P. de Châtel for discussion, J.M. Luck for performing the stability analysis with Macsyma, and H.J. Sommers for communicating ref. [11] prior to publication. He is grateful for hospitality at the S.Ph.T. of the CEA Saclay, where part of this work was performed. This work was made possible by the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

---

[1] J. Jäckle, Phil. Magazine B **44** (1981) 533
[2] R.G. Palmer, Adv. in Physics **31** (1982) 669
[3] This sudden loss of entropy is reminiscent of the collaps of the wave function in the quantum measurement.
[4] E. Leutheusser, Phys. Rev. A **29** (1984) 2765; U. Bengtzelius, W. Götze, and A. Sjölander, J. Phys. C **17** (1984) 5915
[5] R. Schmitz, J.W. Dufty, and P. De, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 2066
[6] T.R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 2091
[7] A. Crisanti and H.J. Sommers, Z. Physik B **87** (1992) 341
[8] A. Crisanti, H. Horner, and H.J. Sommers, Z. Phys. B **92** (1993) 257
[9] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 173
[10] J. Kurchan, G. Parisi, and M.A. Virasoro, J. Phys. I (France) **3** (1993) 1819
[11] A. Crisanti and H.J. Sommers, preprint (1994)
[12] Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Exactly solvable mode of a quantum spin glass*, Phys. Rev. Lett. (1995), to appear
[13] Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Quantum description of spherical spins*, Phys. Rev. Lett. (1995), to appear
[14] Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, *To maximize or not to maximize the free energy of glassy systems,!=?*, Phys. Rev. Lett. (1995), to appear
[15] A.J. Bray and M.A. Moore, J. Phys. C **13** (1980) L469; F. Tanaka and S.F. Edwards, J. Phys. F **10** (1980) 2769; C. De Dominicis, M. Gabay, T. Garel, and H. Orland, J. Phys. (Paris) **41** (1980) 923; H. Rieger, Phys. Rev. B **46** (1992) 14665
[16] Actually the absolute value of the determinant should be taken. The difference will be discussed below.
[17] J. Kurchan, J. Phys. A **24** (1991) 4969
[18] Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen and M.C.W. van Rossum, Phys. Lett. A **160** (1991) 461
[19] W.L. McMillan, J. Phys. C **17** (1984) 3179; D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 1601
[20] Upon taking $u = 0$, we just get $F_u = 0$. So our approach does not yield the number of TAP states $\mathcal{N} \gg 1$. That should indeed not happen, since the procedure of replacing the Z_u by a pathintegral [16] introduces negative contributions from nonstable solutions of the TAP equations. [17]. For the partition sum ($u = 1$) this is not essential, as the relevant states have the largest weight. For $u = 0$, however, all weights are ± 1, and the answer should be $Z_0 = 1$. [17] Kurchan showed explicitly that the saddlepoint value of $[Z_0]_{av}$, where $[..]_{av}$ is the disorder average, has a prefactor that vanishes to all orders in $1/N$. We confirm that in the limit $u \to 0$, $Z_u \sim \exp(N^0)$.
[21] 1) Although in our model the variable u does not show up in the location of the marginal saddle point, it remains relevant for its stability, and thus for the extremal value of x. For marginal solutions it is therefore incorrect to perform the calculation of the complexity separately from the one for the free energy, as was done by CS. [11]
2) As CS approximated $[\ln \mathcal{N}_a]_{av}$ by $\ln[\mathcal{N}_a]_{av}$, we can follow their steps by neglecting replica symmetry breaking through putting $x \equiv 1$. We then find the same saddle point as function of q, and $\Phi_n = n\mathcal{I}_c/N$ reproduces eq. (6). However, in this calculation one of the fluctuation modes becomes unstable when u becomes less than $(p-2)(1-q)/q$; this is the remnant of eq. (11) for $x(q,u) = 1$. At $u = 0$ it thus proves that the CS saddle point is unstable w.r.t. replica symmetry breaking.
[22] F. Lefloch, J. Hammann, M. Ocio, and E. Vincent, Europhys. Lett. **18** (1992) 647
[23] G. Parisi and G. Toulouse, J. Phys. (Paris) (1980)
[24] This happens since at $H = 0$ its (free) energy fluctuations are not $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ but $\mathcal{O}(1)$, as can be seen by expanding the result for $\ln[Z^n]_{av}$ to order n^2. For $H = 0$ there appear no terms of order $n^2 N$; for $H \neq 0$ they do appear.